

**Cumulative Table of Cases**  
**Connecticut Reports**  
**Volume 335**

*(Replaces Prior Cumulative Table)*

American Tax Funding, LLC v. First Eagle Corp. (Order) . . . . .	942
BAC Home Loans Servicing, L.P. v. Farina (Order) . . . . .	971
Bagaloo v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) . . . . .	905
Bank of America, N.A. v. Balgobin (Order) . . . . .	903
Bank of New York Mellon v. Orlando (Order) . . . . .	917
Bank of New York Mellon v. Ruttkamp (Order) . . . . .	919
Bank of New York Mellon v. Ruttkamp (Order) . . . . .	951
Benitez v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) . . . . .	924
Berger v. Deutermann (Order) . . . . .	956
Berka v. Middletown (Order) . . . . .	906
Boone v. Boehringer Ingelheim Pharmaceuticals, Inc. . . . .	547
<i>Product liability; motion for summary judgment; request to charge; spoliation of evidence; whether trial court properly precluded evidence and arguments related to spoliation; whether trial court properly prevented plaintiff from using excerpt from deposition on rebuttal; whether trial court properly granted defendants' motion for summary judgment as to design defect claim on ground that claim was preempted by federal law; whether trial court committed reversible error when it issued curative instruction to jury after closing arguments.</i>	
Boria v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) . . . . .	901
Boyd v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) . . . . .	962
Brown v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) . . . . .	920
Budziszewski v. Connecticut Judicial Branch (Order) . . . . .	965
Carabetta Organization, Ltd. v. Meriden (Order) . . . . .	940
Carpenter v. Daar (Order) . . . . .	962
Castro v. Bajana (Order) . . . . .	958
Chelsea Groton Bank v. Belltown Sports, LLC (Order) . . . . .	960
Cheswold (TL), LLC, BMO Harris Bank, N.A. v. Kwong (Order) . . . . .	941
Chief Disciplinary Counsel v. Burbank (Order) . . . . .	906
Christiana Trust v. Bliss (Order) . . . . .	916
Cinotti v. Shred It U.S.A., LLC (Order) . . . . .	930
Citibank, N.A. v. Stein (Order) . . . . .	975
Clinton v. Aspinwall (Orders) . . . . .	979, 980
Cohen v. Postal Holdings, LLC (Order) . . . . .	969
Cooke v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) . . . . .	911
Costanzo v. Plainfield (Order) . . . . .	976
Crouzet v. First Baptist Church of Stonington (Order) . . . . .	979
Daley v. Kashmanian (Orders) . . . . .	939, 940
Davis v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) . . . . .	948
Davis v. Davis (Order) . . . . .	977
Dept. of Social Services v. Freeman (Order) . . . . .	922
Deutsche Bank National Trust Co. v. Pototschnig (Order) . . . . .	977
Deutsche Bank National Trust Co. v. Shivers (Order) . . . . .	974
Diaz v. Commissioner of Correction . . . . .	53
<i>Habeas corpus; claim of ineffective assistance of counsel; certification to appeal from habeas court's judgment; certification from Appellate Court; whether Appellate Court improperly raised and decided unpreserved issue of waiver without first providing parties opportunity to be heard on that issue, in contravention of this court's decision in Blumberg Associates Worldwide, Inc. v. Brown &amp; Brown of Connecticut, Inc. (311 Conn. 123); proper scope of order of remand to Appellate Court, discussed.</i>	
Diaz v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) . . . . .	971
Diaz v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) . . . . .	981
Dombrowski v. New Haven (Order) . . . . .	908
Edward Kowalsky Revocable Trust v. B & D Properties, LLC (Order) . . . . .	914
Ervin v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) . . . . .	905

Factor King, LLC v. Housing Authority (Order) . . . . .	927
Farrell v. Johnson & Johnson . . . . .	398
<i>Informed consent; innocent misrepresentation; directed verdict; certification from Appellate Court; whether Appellate Court correctly concluded that trial court did not abuse its discretion in declining to admit into evidence two medical journal articles on ground that they constituted inadmissible hearsay; claim that articles were admissible to prove what defendant physician knew or reasonably should have known with respect to experimental nature of procedure used to implant medical product in plaintiff patient and product itself; whether Appellate Court properly upheld trial court's decision to direct verdict on plaintiffs' innocent misrepresentation claim; whether innocent misrepresentation claim was viable in context of provision of medical services.</i>	
Fazio v. Fazio (Order) . . . . .	963
Federal National Mortgage Assn. v. Trojan (Order) . . . . .	910
Ferri v. Powell-Ferri (Order) . . . . .	970
500 North Avenue, LLC v. Planning Commission (Order) . . . . .	959
Flood v. Flood (Order) . . . . .	960
Foisie v. Foisie . . . . .	525
<i>Dissolution of marriage; motion to open dissolution judgment; motion to substitute as defendants coexecutors of deceased defendant's estate; whether trial court improperly denied plaintiff's motion to substitute pursuant to statute (§ 52-599); whether substitution was permitted under § 52-599 (b); whether trial court correctly concluded that substitution under § 52-599 (b) was precluded under § 52-599 (c) (1) on ground that substitution would have defeated or render useless motion to open dissolution judgment.</i>	
Fry v. Lobbruzzo (Order) . . . . .	951
Garcia v. Cohen . . . . .	3
<i>Premises liability; negligence; contributory negligence; general verdict rule; certification from Appellate Court; whether Appellate Court correctly concluded that general verdict rule precluded it from reviewing plaintiff's claim of instructional error; whether proposed interrogatories were properly framed; nondelegable duty doctrine, discussed; whether Appellate Court incorrectly concluded that plaintiff's instructional error claim was not reviewable on ground that plaintiff had failed to raise independent claim of error on appeal with respect to trial court's decision not to submit her proposed interrogatories to jury.</i>	
Gawlik v. Semple (Order) . . . . .	953
Georges v. OB-GYN Services, P.C. . . . .	669
<i>Medical malpractice; whether Appellate Court properly granted plaintiffs' motion to dismiss portion of defendants' appeal challenging jury verdict as untimely; claim that judgment did not become final for purposes of appeal when trial court accepted jury verdict because court had yet to determine whether, or how much, offer of compromise interest should be awarded; claim that, under rule of practice (§ 63-1) governing time to appeal, plaintiffs' motion for offer of compromise and postjudgment interest created new twenty day period within which defendants could appeal from judgment rendered in accordance with jury verdict; claim that plaintiffs' motion for offer of compromise and postjudgment interest altered terms of judgment under Practice Book § 63-1 (c) (1) because it changed judgment from initial amount of verdict to amount of verdict plus interest; whether Appellate Court abused its discretion in denying defendants' motion to suspend rules of practice to permit late appeal; whether defendants established good cause for late appeal on basis of their claimed good faith belief that there was no appealable final judgment until trial court awarded offer of compromise and postjudgment interest.</i>	
Giordano v. Giordano (Order) . . . . .	970
Goguen v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) . . . . .	925
Hall v. Hall . . . . .	377
<i>Dissolution of marriage; motion for contempt; motion for reconsideration; joint motion to open and vacate contempt finding; certification from Appellate Court; whether Appellate Court correctly concluded that trial court did not abuse its discretion in finding plaintiff in contempt on basis of his wilful violation of court order; claim that trial court failed to consider plaintiff's testimony that, when he violated court order, he was relying in good faith on advice of counsel; whether Appellate Court correctly concluded that trial court did not abuse its discretion in denying parties' joint motion to open and vacate finding of contempt.</i>	

Hamann v. Carl (Orders) . . . . .	949
Hassiem v. O & G Industries, Inc. (Order) . . . . .	928
Haywood v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) . . . . .	914
Holliday v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) . . . . .	901
In re Aisjaha N. (Order) . . . . .	943
In re Brian P. (Order) . . . . .	907
In re Cataleya M. (Order) (See In re Gabriel C.) . . . . .	938
In re Corey C. (Order) . . . . .	930
In re Elizabeth W. (Order) . . . . .	967
In re Faiz Siddiqui (Order) . . . . .	955
In re Gabriel C. (Order) . . . . .	938
In re Isabella M. (Order) (See In re Gabriel C.) . . . . .	938
In re Omar I. (Order) . . . . .	924
In re Savannah F. (Order) (See In re Gabriel C.) . . . . .	938
In re Xavier H. (Orders) . . . . .	981, 982
Jason B. v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) . . . . .	903
Jemiola v. Hartford Casualty Ins. Co. . . . .	117
<i>Homeowners insurance; breach of contract; denial of coverage by defendant insurance company for cracks in basement walls under provision in policy insuring against collapse of building or part thereof; summary judgment; claim that trial court incorrectly concluded that only homeowners insurance policies issued to plaintiff by defendant since March, 2005, were applicable to plaintiff's claim for coverage; whether there was genuine issue of material fact as to whether structural integrity of plaintiff's basement walls was substantially impaired when policies issued to plaintiff before March, 2005, were in effect; whether trial court correctly concluded that collapse provision of applicable homeowners insurance policy unambiguously excluded coverage for cracks in plaintiff's basement walls; whether plaintiff's house suffered abrupt falling down or caving in, complete or partial, such that it could not be occupied for its intended purpose; claim that definition of "collapse" contained in policy was ambiguous and, therefore, that substantial impairment of structural integrity standard adopted by this court in Beach v. Middlesex Mutual Assurance Co. (205 Conn. 246) applied for purpose of determining coverage.</i>	
Jepsen v. Camassar (Order) . . . . .	926
Johnson v. Preleski . . . . .	138
<i>Petition for new trial based on newly discovered evidence; certification from Appellate Court; claim that petition was time barred because it was served on respondent state's attorney one day after expiration of applicable limitation period; whether Appellate Court incorrectly concluded that savings statute (§ 52-593a (a)), which requires that process be personally delivered to marshal within applicable limitation period, did not save untimely petition when process was sent by facsimile to marshal on final day of limitation period but there was no evidence as to when marshal came into physical possession of process; whether process is personally delivered to marshal within meaning of § 52-593a (a) when sender transmits it by facsimile; whether there was sufficient evidence to establish that process was personally delivered to marshal within applicable limitation period.</i>	
Jordan v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) . . . . .	931
Josephine Towers, L.P. v. Kelly (Order) . . . . .	966
Kammili v. Kammili (Order) . . . . .	947
Karagozian v. USV Optical, Inc. . . . .	426
<i>Wrongful discharge; motion to strike; certification from Appellate Court; whether Appellate Court properly upheld trial court's granting of defendant employer's motion to strike plaintiff employee's complaint; whether standard for constructive discharge set forth in Britnell v. Dept. of Correction (247 Conn. 148) required plaintiff to demonstrate that defendant intended to force plaintiff to resign; whether Appellate Court correctly upheld trial court's granting of motion to strike on alternative ground that plaintiff had failed to allege facts establishing that work atmosphere was so difficult or unpleasant that reasonable person in his shoes would have felt compelled to resign.</i>	
Karas v. Liberty Ins. Corp. . . . .	62
<i>Homeowners insurance; breach of contract; crumbling foundations; motion for summary judgment; certified question from United States District Court for District of Connecticut; reformulation of certified question; whether substantial impairment of structural integrity standard, as set forth in Beach v. Middlesex Mutual Assurance Co. (205 Conn. 246), was applicable to provision of plaintiffs' home-</i>	

<i>owners insurance policy covering collapse of building; evidence required to satisfy substantial impairment of structural integrity standard, discussed; claim that, to satisfy substantial impairment of structural integrity standard, home must be in imminent danger of falling down or caving in, that is, in imminent danger of actual collapse; whether coverage exclusion in plaintiffs' homeowners insurance policy for collapse of "foundation" unambiguously included basement walls of plaintiffs' home.</i>	
Kirby v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) . . . . .	930
Kohl's Dept. Stores, Inc. v. Rocky Hill (Order) . . . . .	917
Kovachich v. Dept. of Mental Health & Addiction Services (Order) . . . . .	958
Labissoniere v. Gaylord Hospital, Inc. (Orders) . . . . .	968
Langston v. Commissioner of Correction. . . . .	1
<i>Habeas corpus; certification from Appellate Court; claim that habeas court improperly dismissed habeas petition as untimely filed; whether Appellate Court correctly concluded that petitioner lacked good cause for his untimely filing when he had relied on advice of his attorney to withdraw previous, validly filed petition and to file present petition in its place, even though it would be subject to statutory (§ 52-470 (d)) presumption of delay; certification improvidently granted.</i>	
Larmel v. Metro North Commuter Railroad Co. (Order) . . . . .	972
Lemanski v. Commissioner of Motor Vehicles (Order) . . . . .	964
Lenti v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) . . . . .	905
Lepeska v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) . . . . .	972
Lime Rock Park, LLC v. Planning & Zoning Commission . . . . .	606
<i>Zoning; motor vehicle racing; administrative appeal challenging defendant planning and zoning commission's adoption of certain amendments to zoning regulations; whether plaintiff landowner waived its right to challenge certain amendments to zoning regulations because plaintiff's predecessor in interest previously had stipulated to restrictions that amendments were intended to codify or because plaintiff and its predecessor in interest continuously had abided by those restrictions; reviewability of claim that plaintiff waived its right to challenge amendments to zoning regulations that purportedly recodified prior amendments to zoning regulations because plaintiff had not challenged prior amendments; claim that zoning regulations restricting motor vehicle racing on Sundays were preempted by statute (§ 14-164a (a)); whether § 14-164a (a) was prohibitory or permissive for preemption purposes; whether "weekday," as used in zoning regulations, was intended to include Saturday; whether zoning regulation restricting unmuffled racing activities on property constituted noise control ordinance for purposes of Noise Pollution Control Act (§ 22a-73); whether plaintiff had standing to challenge regulations requiring that it obtain special permit and site plan as condition to filing petition seeking amendment to zoning regulations; whether regulation requiring plaintiff to obtain special permit and site plan as condition to filing petition seeking amendment to zoning regulations was invalid.</i>	
Lopez v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) . . . . .	904
Maldonado v. Flannery (Order) . . . . .	967
Maldonado v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) . . . . .	980
Maselli v. Regional School District Number 10 (Order) . . . . .	947
McLoughlin v. Planning & Zoning Commission (Order) . . . . .	978
Merrit Medical Center Owners Corp., Inc. v. Gianetti (Order) . . . . .	950
Mortgage Electric Registration Systems, Inc. v. Book (Order) . . . . .	967
Morton v. Syriac (Order) . . . . .	915
Mosby v. Board of Education (Order) . . . . .	939
Moyher v. Moyher (Order) . . . . .	965
MTGLQ Investors, L.P. v. Hammons (Order) . . . . .	950
Nationstar Mortgage, LLC v. Washington (Orders) . . . . .	909
Nietupski v. Del Castillo (Order) . . . . .	916
Nonhuman Rights Project, Inc. v. R.W. Commerford & Sons, Inc. (Order) . . . . .	929
Office of Chief Disciplinary Counsel v. Miller . . . . .	474
<i>Attorney misconduct; presentment; appeal from judgment of trial court suspending defendant attorney from practice of law; whether trial court's denial of defendant's motion for articulation or Appellate Court's refusal to order articulation violated defendant's due process rights; whether trial court incorrectly concluded that defendant engaged in misconduct sufficient to warrant discipline; whether trial court incorrectly concluded that defendant's claims of racial discrimination and retaliation were not properly raised in presentment hearing; adoption of trial court's memorandum of decision as proper statement of applicable law.</i>	

Olbrych v. Kaster Moving Co. (Order) . . . . .	952
Pack 2000, Inc. v. Cushman (Order) . . . . .	965
Pentland v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) . . . . .	919
Pentland v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) . . . . .	973
Peterson v. Torrington (Order) . . . . .	921
Petrucci v. Meriden (Order) . . . . .	923
Pfister v. Madison Beach Hotel, LLC (Order) . . . . .	923
Platt v. Tilcon Connecticut, Inc. (Order) . . . . .	917
Priore v. Haig (Order) . . . . .	955
Reserve Realty, LLC v. BLT Reserve, LLC (see Reserve Realty, LLC v. Windemere Reserve, LLC) . . . . .	174
Reserve Realty, LLC v. Windemere Reserve, LLC . . . . .	174
<i>Breach of contract; anticipatory breach; antitrust; claim that plaintiffs could not recover brokerage fees under certain real estate listing agreements because those agreements were list-back agreements that, defendants claimed, constituted per se illegal tying arrangements in violation of federal Sherman Act (15 U.S.C. § 1); certification from Appellate Court; claim that this court should overrule State v. Hossan-Maxwell, Inc. (181 Conn. 655), which held that list-back agreements committing purchaser of real property to use services of particular broker when leasing or reselling property are per se illegal, as no longer consistent with federal antitrust law; Hossan-Maxwell, Inc., to extent it held that real estate list-back agreements affecting not insubstantial volume of commerce are per se illegal, overruled; newly clarified standard governing antitrust challenges to list-back agreements, discussed.</i>	
Rojas v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) . . . . .	925
Ruiz v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) . . . . .	915
Saunders v. KDFBS, LLC . . . . .	586
<i>Foreclosure; judgment of foreclosure by sale; whether Appellate Court improperly dismissed appeal for lack of final judgment; claim that appeal to Appellate Court was not from judgment of foreclosure by sale because appeal challenged trial court's priority determination rather than plaintiff's right to foreclose on mortgage; claim that appeal of priority determination before trial court's approval of sale and rendering of supplemental judgment was premature.</i>	
Scholz v. Epstein (Order) . . . . .	943
Seaport Capital Partners, LLC v. Speer (Order) . . . . .	903
Semac Electric Co. v. Skanska USA Building, Inc. (Orders) . . . . .	945
Schwerin v. Ratcliffe . . . . .	300
<i>Action seeking judgment declaring proper distribution of assets from two family trusts; motions for summary judgment; per stirpes distribution of trusts; claim that stirpital roots should begin at level of grantor's grandchildren, resulting in trust principal being initially divided into six equal shares; claim that stirpital roots should be determined once trust terms expire and that roots should be at whatever level of descendants has members living at time of expiration; claim that trial court correctly determined that stirpital roots should be at level of grantor's children, resulting in trust principal being initially divided into three equal shares; claim that, because trusts provided for principal to be distributed to grantors' issue "then living," grantors could not have intended for initial division to be at level of three children.</i>	
Sherman v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) . . . . .	929
Silver v. Silver (Order) . . . . .	973
Smulley v. Safeco Ins. Co. of Illinois (Order) . . . . .	978
Spicer v. Montagnese (Order) . . . . .	954
Stanley v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) . . . . .	946
Starboard Resources, Inc. v. Henry (Order) . . . . .	919
State v. Agadjanian (Order) . . . . .	963
State v. Albert D. (Order) . . . . .	913
State v. Auburn W. (Order) . . . . .	950
State v. Bermudez (Order) . . . . .	908
State v. Bradbury (Order) . . . . .	925
State v. Brown (Order) . . . . .	902
State v. Brown (Order) . . . . .	942
State v. Bunn (Order) . . . . .	918
State v. Carpenter (Order) . . . . .	940
State v. Coleman (Order) . . . . .	966

State v. Corprew (Order) . . . . .	918
State v. Covington . . . . .	212
<i>Carrying pistol or revolver without permit; certification from Appellate Court; claim that Appellate Court incorrectly concluded that there was sufficient evidence to support defendant's conviction of carrying pistol or revolver without permit; whether state presented sufficient, circumstantial evidence to permit jury reasonably to conclude beyond reasonable doubt that firearm defendant was carrying had barrel less than twelve inches in length.</i>	
State v. Crafter (Order) . . . . .	957
State v. Curet (Order) . . . . .	969
State v. Douglas C. (Order) . . . . .	904
State v. Dyou (Order) . . . . .	948
State v. Earley (Order) . . . . .	902
State v. Elmassri (Order) . . . . .	976
State v. Errol J. (Order) . . . . .	962
State v. Fortin (Order) . . . . .	926
State v. Francis (Order) . . . . .	912
State v. Gaston (Order) . . . . .	981
State v. Hargett (Order) . . . . .	952
State v. Harris (Order) . . . . .	961
State v. Hernandez (Order) . . . . .	960
State v. Holley (Order) . . . . .	922
State v. Ingala (Order) . . . . .	954
State v. Jackson (Order) . . . . .	957
State v. Joseph V. (Order) . . . . .	945
State v. Kosuda-Bigazzi . . . . .	327
<i>Murder; tampering with physical evidence; appeal pursuant to statute (§ 52-265a) involving matter of substantial public interest; claim that trial court improperly denied motion to dismiss charges; whether trial court committed clear error in determining that defendant failed to establish that certain documents seized by police pursuant to search warrant were protected by attorney-client privilege; whether trial court abused its discretion in limiting testimony of defendant's expert witnesses and in precluding testimony of two other expert witnesses; claim that manner in which documents were maintained established that they were privileged; claim that documents were sufficient in and of themselves to be considered privileged because their content was obviously useful to preparing defense; claim that documents in one seized file were privileged because they were substantively identical to documents in other seized file that parties had stipulated was covered by attorney-client privilege; claim that file containing estate planning documents was subject to attorney-client privilege because documents were created for purpose of seeking legal advice; whether trial court abused its discretion in determining that dismissal of charges was not warranted and that state established by clear and convincing evidence that remedial steps it took could cure any presumed prejudice and prevent future prejudice to defendant.</i>	
State v. Leniart (Order) . . . . .	971
State v. Lopez (Order) . . . . .	951
State v. Lori T. (Order) . . . . .	956
State v. Lynch (Order) . . . . .	914
State v. Marrero (Order) . . . . .	961
State v. Mayo (Order) . . . . .	954
State v. Milner (Order) . . . . .	928
State v. Mitchell (Order) . . . . .	912
State v. Nusser (Order) . . . . .	918
State v. Petersen (Order) . . . . .	921
State v. Pjura (Order) . . . . .	977
State v. Prince A. (Order) . . . . .	949
State v. Randy G. (Order) . . . . .	911
State v. Rhodes . . . . .	226
<i>Criminal possession of firearm; having weapon in motor vehicle; whether evidence was sufficient to support conviction of criminal possession of firearm when evidence established only that defendant and firearm were in same car at same time; whether there was sufficient evidence from which jury reasonably could have found that defendant constructively possessed firearm; whether evidence was sufficient to support conviction of having weapon in motor vehicle; claim that "knowingly has" element of statute ((Rev. to 2013) § 29-38 (a)) prohibiting</i>	

<i>having weapon in motor vehicle should be construed to mean “knowingly possesses”; whether trial court committed plain error in applying law existing at time of defendant’s trial; defendant’s request that this court exercise its supervisory authority over administration of justice.</i>	
State v. Richards (Order) . . . . .	931
State v. Rivera (Order) . . . . .	975
State v. Rivera . . . . .	720
<i>Breach of peace second degree; criminal mischief third degree; threatening second degree; certification from Appellate Court; whether Appellate Court correctly determined that trial court had not abused its discretion when it precluded defendant from cross-examining individual with whom defendant had confrontation giving rise to charges in present case regarding facts underlying that individual’s prior larceny convictions in order to show that such individual had stolen cell phones to support drug habit; whether Appellate Court correctly determined that defendant had failed to establish that trial court violated his rights to confrontation and to present a defense when it precluded him from cross-examining individual with whom defendant had confrontation about fact that that individual, by previously pleading guilty to crime of breach of peace in connection with prior incident, had admitted that he was lying about using pepper spray in self-defense during that prior incident.</i>	
State v. Robert H. (Order) . . . . .	964
State v. Romero (Order) . . . . .	955
State v. Rosa (Order) . . . . .	920
State v. Sawyer . . . . .	29
<i>Possession of child pornography second degree; whether trial court incorrectly concluded that search warrant affidavit provided probable cause to search defendant’s residence for evidence of possession of child pornography; unpreserved claim that this court should adopt more demanding standard under Connecticut constitution for assessing whether there is probable cause to issue search warrant.</i>	
State v. Smith (Order) . . . . .	932
State v. Taupier (Order) . . . . .	928
State v. Taveras (Order) . . . . .	948
State v. Tinsley (Order) . . . . .	927
State v. Torres (Order) . . . . .	913
State v. Tyus (Order) . . . . .	907
State v. Villar (Order) . . . . .	916
State v. Watson (Order) . . . . .	912
State v. White (Order) . . . . .	906
State v. Williams (Order) . . . . .	974
Streifel v. Bulkley (Order) . . . . .	911
Summit Saugatuck, LLC v. Water Pollution Control Authority (Order) . . . . .	944
Syms v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) . . . . .	970
Syms v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) . . . . .	974
Thomas v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) . . . . .	929
Thompson v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) . . . . .	913
Turek v. Zoning Board of Appeals (Order) . . . . .	915
25 Grant Street, LLC v. Bridgeport (Order) . . . . .	966
U.S. Bank, National Assn. v. Madison (Order) . . . . .	941
U.S. Bank, National Assn. v. Mamudi (Order) . . . . .	921
U.S. Bank National Assn. v. Rothermel (Order) . . . . .	910
U.S. Bank Trust, N.A. v. O’Brien (Order) . . . . .	922
Vera v. Liberty Mutual Fire Ins. Co. . . . .	110
<i>Homeowners insurance; breach of contract; motion for summary judgment; removal of action from state court to federal court; certified question from United States District Court for District of Connecticut; reliance on this court’s decision in companion case of Karas v. Liberty Ins. Corp. (335 Conn. 62); whether, to satisfy substantial impairment of structural integrity standard, as set forth in Beach v. Middlesex Mutual Assurance Co. (205 Conn. 246), home must be in imminent danger of falling down or caving in, that is, in imminent danger of actual collapse.</i>	
Wachovia Mortgage, FSB v. Toczek (Order) . . . . .	964
Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. v. Melahn (Order) . . . . .	947
Whitnant v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) . . . . .	969
Williams v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) . . . . .	923
Williams v. Commissioner of Motor Vehicles (Order) . . . . .	952

Winakor v. Savalle (Order) . . . . . 958

Wolfork v. Yale Medical Group . . . . . 448

*Medical negligence; motion to open and vacate judgment of dismissal; whether this court had subject matter jurisdiction to review claims regarding trial court's granting of motion to open and vacate judgment of dismissal; whether defendants' claims on appeal raised colorable challenge to jurisdiction of trial court; difference between trial court's jurisdiction and trial court's authority to act, discussed; whether administrator of decedent's estate had standing to move to open and vacate judgment of dismissal on behalf of estate, even though he was not party to action when court rendered judgment of dismissal.*

Woods v. Commissioner of Correction (Order) . . . . . 938